

APPROVED 7-10-03



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
KIVA - CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
JUNE 19, 2003
MINUTES**

PRESENT: Cynthia Lukas, Council Member
E.L. Cortez, Vice Chairman
Dave Gulino, Planning Commission Member
Jeremy Jones, Design Member
Michael D'Andrea, Design Member
Michael Schmitt, Design Member

ABSENT: Anne Gale, Design Member

STAFF: Donna Bronski
Tim Conner
Tim Curtis
Randy Grant
Keith Niederer
Jayna Shewak
Bill Verschuren
Al Ward

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilman Lukas at 1:15 p.m.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call confirmed members present as stated above.

APPROVED 7-10-03

OPENING STATEMENT

COUNCILMAN LUKAS read the opening statement that describes the role of the Development Review Board and the procedures used in conducting this meeting.

MINUTES APPROVAL

June 5, 2003 Development Review Board Minutes

MR. JONES MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JUNE 5, 2003 MINUTES AS PRESENTED. SECOND BY MR. SCHMITT.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF FOUR (4) TO ZERO (0).

CONSENT AGENDA

13-PP-2001#2 DC Ranch Parcels 2.17, 2.18 and 2.19,
Phase 2 – Replat
Site Plan & Elevations
SEC Desert Camp Dr. & 96th Street alignment

MR. CURTIS presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

10-PP-2003 Montacino McDowell Mountain
Preliminary Plat
330' west of the SWC of Shea Boulevard
& 124th Street
George F. Tibsherany Inc.,
Architect/Designer

MR. CURTIS presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

12-PP-2003 Colina Vista
Replat for 16 Residential Lots
NWC of Cholla Rd & Pima (101) Freeway
LVA Urban Design Studio
Architect/Designer

MR. CURTIS presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

173-DR-1985#4 Ferrari-Maserati Dealership
Elevation Materials & Color Changes
6825 E. McDowell Road

Studio W2, Inc., Architect/Designer

MR. VERSCHUREN presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

116-DR-1998#5

Shops C at Saddle Mountain Plaza
Site Plan & Elevations
11495 N. 136th Street
K & I Architects, Architect/Designer

MR. NIEDERER presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval subject to the attached stipulations.

89-DR-1999#2

Monarch Resort
Site Plan & Elevations
NEC 90th Place & 90th Street
Dale Gardon Design, Architect/Designer
Continued to July 10, 2003

MS. SHEWAK stated the applicant has requested a continuance to the July 10th meeting. However, staff would like to take this opportunity to have the Board look at this case and make sure there are not any outstanding issues that might cause this case to be pulled from the consent agenda at the next hearing.

MR. VERSCHUREN presented this case as per the project coordination packet.

MR. JONES stated he thought it would be important to have three-dimension depiction of the main entrance facade. Mr. Verschuren stated they will have that for the next hearing.

MR. SCHMITT stated he would like to see a variety of colors to add more interest to the building. Mr. Verschuren stated they would work with the applicant in terms of looking at a variety of colors to see if they would work.

MR. D'ANDREA stated he would suggest at the next hearing that the applicant address the scale of the conference addition to the rest pool area.

(VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ ARRIVED AT 1:30 P.M.)

26-DR-2003

Market Street Commons – Parcel 2.6 @
DC Ranch
Site Plan & Elevations
NEC 90th Place & 90th Street
Dale Gardon Design, Architect/Designer

MR. CURTIS presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

(MR. GULINO ARRIVED AT 1:33 P.M.)

29-DR-2003

McDowell Mountain Business Center II.
Site Plan & Elevations
Directly north of WestWorld, between
90th & 91st Streets (south of Rio Verde)
James Elson Architect,
Architect/Designer

MR. WARD presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

MR. SCHMITT stated that the three color samples seem almost to be the same color.

COUNCILMAN LUKAS stated that the colors are very close and there should be a bigger contrast on the colors. Mr. Ward suggested they have the colors come back to a study session.

MR. SCHMITT stated on the renderings, he could not tell the purpose of the circle. Mr. Ward replied it is an area that could be used as a turn around, and is an arriving area.

37-DR-2003

L A Fitness
Site Plan & Elevations
1900 N. Scottsdale Road
Robert Kubicek Architects,
Architect/Designer

MR. CURTIS presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

MR. SCHMITT stated the parking is about as far away from the entry as it can possibly be located. He inquired about the logic behind that. He also inquired about the lack of setback and landscaping on Scottsdale Road side. Mr. Curtis stated there is adequate open space along Scottsdale Road. He further stated they were trying to pull some of the building entrance and activity away from the residential district. They also wanted to get more of a street presence on Scottsdale Road. He noted they do have a shaded walkway on both sides of the building as well as a nice walkway through the parking lot as an approach to the building.

MR. JONES inquired about the overhangs below the windows. He stated he would assume they are to create shadow on the wall but it seems to be a backward element. Mr. Curtis stated that element is to provide shade and a pedestrian scale to the building.

COUNCILMAN LUKAS stated she felt this project would be good for the area.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 13-PP-2001#2 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. CASE 10-PP-2003 WITH ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. CASE 12-PP-2003 WITH ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. CASE 173-DR-1985#4 WITH ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. CASE 116-DR-1998# 5 WITH ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. CASE 26-DR-2003 WITH ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. CASE 29-DR-2003 WITH ATTACHED STIPULATIONS AND THE ADDITIONAL STIPULATION THAT THE COLORS RETURN TO A DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD STUDY SESSION FOR REVIEW. AND CASE 37-DR-2003 WITH ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. SECOND BY MR. JONES.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

REGULAR AGENDA

27-DR-2001#2

Cricket Communications
Revised Screen Wall Elevations
NE Hayden & Jomax Roads.

MS. SHEWAK presented this case as per the project coordination packet. She noted this project received its original DRB approval in 2001. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

MR. GULINO inquired about the plant palette. Ms. Shewak discussed the proposed plant palette.

COUNCILMAN LUKAS commented it is important to get the proper plant density. Ms. Shewak stated they would understand that and they would make sure if this is the plan to consider the plant mortality.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ stated with regard to the original case were there any graphic representations as to the appearance of the wall included in the Board's packet. Ms. Shewak stated the Board's packet showed a diagram that showed some tapering at the bottom of the wall. The detail was not clear. There was color proposed and there was some berming shown in the exhibit. The whole discussion revolved around the batter, tapered wall. There was not good detail available at the time of the Board meeting. She noted that is how the stipulation was written the way it was that it should have a battered element added to it.

Vice Chairman Cortez inquired if the wall was originally to be a CMU because he does recall some discussion in regards to adobe battered wall and the color. He also inquired if the old case file was handy for them to see for the benefit of all

the members of the Board. Ms. Shewak stated the original proposal was for a CMU wall and at that point in time the Board did look at that and wanted to see the adobe as the preferred block choice. There was also some discussion about an existing wall south of this project that there was a desire to match that. However, the matching issue did not make it into the stipulation it was a battering element conversation. She remarked that today the Board has the opportunity to verify this proposal to comply with what could be envisioned for that project.

(COUNCILMAN LUKAS OPENED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

TONY NELSSSEN, 7736 E. Redbird Road, stated he would like to address the plant density. He further stated the issue of plant mortality is a significant issue. He inquired whether there is a watering schedule or is there a current technology that would ensure the livelihood of the plant material. He remarked the site just south of here is the AT&T site and they had stipulations for re-veging and unfortunately in order to water the plants they had to run a water truck through the desert and they had to put in a road and killed other plant materials.

Mr. Nelssen stated this is a wall that was built in noncompliance with the stipulations. He further stated he met with the applicants on the site and discussed the AT&T wall. The materials used. The desire to match those materials. Where to get the materials. They had an extensive debate and it was very clear that the base of the wall would have a greater dimension than the top of the wall. He noted he met with the applicant on the site representing the Desert Property Owners Association and they agreed in the field it should match the AT&T site for consistency. Now, they have put up a CMU wall with stucco and adobe like finish.

Mr. Nelssen stated he felt if the applicant can't build what was approved they should have to go through the use permit process.

Mr. Nelssen stated the other issue is the color, they were supposed to match the AT&T site. He further stated he wants to emphasize the color of the wall. If the Board just approves the battering on the corners that is going to leave the center portion of the wall the red color. He remarked he cannot understand why it is so difficult to build a block fence. He further remarked they should have to go back, use the proper material, and match the AT&T site to batter the walls not just the corners as approved by the original stipulations. If they don't they would be doing nothing but rewarding incompetence with compromise.

(COUNCILMAN LUKAS CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

SCOTT QUINN, Cricket Communications, applicant, stated they would be using gel packs to lubricate the plants so there would not be a need to bring a water truck out to water those plants. He further stated the block is a true adobe block. He noted it has a different tint than you normally see. He remarked that with regard to the discussions out in the field he was not privy to those discussions.

He further remarked they have had a lot of employee turn over in the last few years since the original discussions occurred. He commented based on the stipulations and what they were suppose to build, the only thing they have not abided by was the battered corners. He further commented they are willing to do that and make it blend with the existing adobe block. He noted they are looking to locate on the existing vertical element rather than putting a new tower. He provided comparisons of other sites. He requested approval of this application with the staff's stipulations. He also requested they are allow a temporary certificate of occupancy until they can finalize the final details of the site.

COUNCILMAN LUKAS inquired if the applicant believed if the corners were done alone they would blend with the rest of the wall. Mr. Quinn replied in the affirmative.

MS. SHEWAK reviewed the materials that were presented to the Board when this case was originally approved in June 2001. She stated there was some discussion of battered corner element and whether that should extend around the entire wall is still up for discussion. She stated staff is comfortable with the applicant's proposal. She further stated the color of the brick is a red terra cotta adobe. She remarked staff would like to hear the Board's comments on the brick color and the corner battering elements.

MR. JONES stated if a battered wall was agreed to and shown on the drawing it should be provided. He further stated it would be the only way to get to a softer less aggressive color that would recede a little more into the desert. He remarked this is the kind of situation that shows the importance of landscaping. He further remarked he would not be in favor of just battering the corners because a simpler battered wall around the entire thing would be more appealing.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ stated he appreciates staff providing a historical prospective. He further stated he does recall that there was a discussion about a battered wall and it was not restricted to the corner portion of the structure. He remarked that with regard to color he remembered the AT&T wall being used as an example as a color choice. He commented he was disappointed that this information was not transferred from one Cricket employee to another. He further commented he would not concur with the staffs' position to only batter the corners. He remarked he would ask that they look at battering the entire structure along with changing the color to match the AT&T wall.

COUNCILMAN LUKAS stated she was not sitting on the Board when this request was originally heard but after hearing Mr. Cortez explain the Board's intent she felt they need to hold to that.

MR. GULINO inquired who initiated this case. Ms. Shewak replied through inspection services and the neighbors in the area.

Mr. Gulino inquired about the berm that was to go around the wall. Ms. Shewak stated there is a berm built around the wall so that you do not see the CMU and that requirement has been satisfied.

Mr. Gulino requested additional information on the color of the brick. Ms. Shewak stated the brick color in a red terra cotta. Mr. Gulino inquired if there were any treatments available like acid wash other than painting it to tone it down. Mr. Quinn replied due to the fact it is porous, it would make it very difficult. He stated he would suggest what they could do to mitigate this is to not do the battered corners but concentrate on putting in additional vegetation to screen and maybe berm it up.

Mr. Gulino stated he would agree they had an approval, the instructions were clear, and if they had any problems, they should have raised them before they built the wall. He further stated his position would be to uphold the original case.

Mr. Gulino inquired if granting a temporary certificate of occupancy was within their purview.

MS. SHEWAK stated that before the Board makes a decision staff would request some very specific direction on this case so the applicant understands what he is going to revise his plans to match.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ inquired if the applicant would prefer a continuance or a denial. Mr. Quinn stated they would prefer a continuance. He reiterated the fact that it is important for them to be able to receive the temporary certificate of occupancy.

MS. BRONSKI stated granting a temporary certificate of occupancy is not within the jurisdiction of this Board. She further stated it is the part of the building inspection process. She noted the Board could express their feelings and that would be taken into consideration but the ultimate decision would be made by Inspection Services.

MR. GULINO stated he felt the Board and staff have some accountability because of the discrepancy between what the Board remembers and what happened two years ago versus what was given to the applicant in written stipulations. He further stated it seems something that should be very simple is getting more and more complicated. He commented he would encourage staff, if possible, to work with the applicant and maybe give them a 60 day temporary certificate of occupancy that would at least give them something to get the facility operation. He concluded he would encourage the applicant to come back and do it the way it was intended to be done.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO CONTINUE CASE 27-DR-2001#2.

THE APPLICANT CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THAT THE INTENT OF THIS BOARD IS FOR THE ENTIRE PERIMETER OF THE NEW WALL WILL BE BATTERED.

THE COLOR WILL BE REVISED TO MATCH AS CLOSELY AS POSSIBLE TO THE AT&T FACILITY DIRECTLY SOUTH OF THIS EXISTING CRICKET SITE.

STAFF INVESTIGATES THE POSSIBILITY OF PROVIDING THIS APPLICANT A 60-DAY TEMPORARY CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY.

COUNCILMAN LUKAS inquired if Vice Chairman Cortez would like to make that stronger rather than investigate the possibility they can recommend as a Board that they be given the 60-Day Certificate of Occupancy.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ AMENDED THE MOTION AS FOLLOWS:

THE BOARD STRONGLY RECOMMENDS THE APPLICANT BE GIVEN A 60 DAY TEMPORARY CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY.

MR. GULINO requested clarification on the intent of the motion. He inquired if the intent of the motion is for the applicant to bring a new drawing back. Vice Chairman Cortez stated the intent is to clarify the discrepancies between the record. Currently there is inconsistent design intent and he would like to see a document with the battered wall around the entire perimeter.

MR. JONES stated in the detail that was provided in this submittal there is an outside battered wall being added to the present wall. If they batter the whole wall you don't see the present wall so the color issues goes away as long as the new wall is the recommended color. He further stated he wanted to make sure everyone was aware of that.

SECOND BY MR. JONES.

MS. SHEWAK stated for clarification there was significant discussion about the building material type being adobe and she wanted to make sure that was still part of the motion. Vice Chairman Cortez replied in the affirmative.

MS. BRONSKI stated she would request that the Board indicate what they want the wall to look like with regard to the color and the materials.

COUNCILMAN LUKAS requested Vice Chairman Cortez restates the motion.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO CONTINUE CASE 27-DR-2001#2.

WITH THE APPLICANT BEING ASKED TO PROVIDE DOCUMENTATION IN DRAWING FORMAT THAT WOULD INDICATE THE ENTIRE PERIMETER WALL AT THIS NEW FACILITY IS BATTERED.

THE COLOR IS REVISED TO MATCH THE EXISTING AT&T FACILITY IMMEDIATELY SOUTH OF THIS PARTICULAR SITE.

THE BOARD RECOMMENDS THAT THE STAFF INVESTIGATE A 60-DAY TEMPORARY CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY FOR THE APPLICANT.

IN ADDITION TO THIS, THEY WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE AMENDED LANDSCAPE PLAN WITH THE NEXT SUBMITTAL INDICATING THE REINSTALLATION OF THE DESTROYED LANDSCAPE.

THE NEW PERIMETER WALL BE ADOBE.

MR. JONES SECONDED THE RESTATED MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

28-DR—2003

Villages at Pinnacle Peak
Site Plan & Elevations
West of the NWC of Alma School &
Jomax Roads
S K D Inc., Architect/Designer

MR. WARD presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

MR. JONES stated it appears they get the landscape requirement from the adjacent protected landscape area. He further stated the actual ground plane landscape area is very close to zero. Mr. Ward stated the site meets and exceeds the open space criteria for parking lot, base planting, and natural area open space. Mr. Jones inquired about the 12 foot base planting adjacent to the buildings noting that does not reflect well on the site plan. Mr. Ward stated staff would work with the applicant to make sure it is provided.

MR. D'ANDREA stated he thought it would be helpful to see elevations of the entire frontage along the southern boundary of the property line.

Mr. D'Andrea inquired about the time frame for the emergency access on the east side of the site. Mr. Ward stated they are working with the landowners to the east and it has been submitted it would be completed within a year. Mr. D'Andrea stated it appears that if you sent a fire truck down the last parking isle to the north it would need to go down there to protect the buildings but it would not be able to turn around. He further stated usually on a building like this there

is a loop or emergency road to allow for that. Mr. Ward stated there is a full loop around there. He further stated Rural Metro has reviewed this and they did not see a problem.

COUNCILMAN LUKAS stated in the report it states 202 spaces are required and 146 are provided. Mr. Ward stated that is an error it should be the other way around.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ stated that he felt the light color would wash out in the Arizona sun. He further stated the applicant might want to consider making the color a little stronger. Mr. Ward stated staff would work with the applicant to darken the color.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE, CASE 28-DR-2003 WITH THE ADDED STIPULATION THAT STAFF WORKS WITH THE APPLICANT REGARDING DARKENING UP THE LIGHT COLOR. SECOND BY MR. JONES.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

33-DR-2003

Loloma – Phase 1, Downtown Scottsdale
Residential
Site Plan & Elevations
7033 E. Main Street
DFD Cornoyer Hedrick,
Architect/Designer

MR. VERSCHUREN presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

SUSAN BITTER SMITH, representing Arruth Associates Inc., provided a brief overview of the design of the project. She stated this is the final stage of a six-year project. She further stated the design proposal is intended to produce pedestrian friendly community that blends into one of a kind residential units with an arts entertainment destination. She provided background information on the project.

STEVE BASSETT, DFD Cornoyer Hedrick, discussed the site context issues. The first phase is a link to Main Street. The ramp location has been moved so the main access is off Marshall way. The project is a compliment to the historic Main Street and downtown fabric of Scottsdale. He also discussed the architectural design and character. He reviewed the materials and colors that have been selected for this project.

MR. D'ANDREA inquired if they planned on showing the Board a vehicular circulation pattern that will show how the residents verses the public will use the site. Mr. Bassett stated they could provide that document.

PETER CURE', Arterra Inc., Landscape Architecture, stated they have been working on this project since the beginning. He provided an overview of the hardscape and the landscape proposed for the project.

MR. JONES stated it is important to bring in the urban housing to the downtown to make the city work. He further stated he wants to make sure he understands the site plan. He noted the site plan implies that you could drive through the swimming pool to get to the parking but in reality, they are showing hardscape on two different levels. Mr. Cure' stated that is correct. They split the plan. They wanted them to understand there was the terrace up there. The pool area is on the first floor area and the parking garage is on the second level.

MR. SCHMITT inquired about the artists alley noting they come from a very pedestrian friendly environment into what seems like a fairly narrow and deep canyon kind of affect as they walk through there. He commented he does not see much in the way of planting opportunities to create any soft texture. It is a lot of hardscape and building walls. Mr. Cure' stated that was intentionally done. They want to create a bit of intrigue and make you want to go in there and see what is going on. They wanted to open this project up to Main Street. There will be some pots with some trees in them.

MS. BITTER SMITH stated they would provide the Board with the vehicular circulation plan. She further stated the transit center also has a plaza area and it is the city's intent to program that with activities.

(COUNCILMAN LUKAS OPENED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

THOMAS GILLER, 2940 N. 67th Place, representing the owners of the property at Marshall Square Enterprises. He further stated that in more than 20 years of real estate business he has seen no more forthright developers than Arruth Associates. He remarked they have the normal concerns regarding setback, step backs, and height as it relates to Main Street and the current configurations of the buildings. He further remarked there is a large pine tree on Main Street that he would hate to see taken down. He noted that he has not heard from the City regarding the museum project. He concluded he is in favor of this project.

(COUNCILMAN LUKAS CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

COUNCILMAN LUKAS stated they would do a better job informing people regarding these projects.

MR. CURE´ stated it is unfortunate that they would have to remove that pine tree. He further stated that tree is probably in the later stage of its life. They felt the sacrifice of getting rid of that tree far outweighed the benefits of the other plants they would be bringing in and the use the public will get out of this space.

COUNCILMAN LUKAS stated she thought the overall design of this project is quite impressive. She further stated she likes the style, colors, and texture of the materials. She remarked it is an exciting day for this project and everyone has worked hard to see it come to fruition. The project will have a great pedestrian orientation. It will be a gateway. The shade structure will be a pivotal gathering place. The landscaping palette looks good. There is a lot of a landscaping that will soften these structures. She commented she likes the idea of the alley concept. The narrow walkways really do draw people in. She concluded this is a good project.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ inquired when will the ground breaking take place. Ms. Bitter Smith replies in the Spring of 2004.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 33-DR-2003 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. SECOND BY MR. SCHMITT.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

34-DR-2003

Eckerd Drug Store
Site Plan & Elevations
Drugstore and a commercial pad
NWC Indian School & Miller Rds
Sam J. West Architect, Architect/Designer

MR. GRANT presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval subject to the attached and revised stipulations.

MR. GULINO inquired if there would be opportunity for shared parking with the Design Studio and the restaurant. Mr. Grant stated the applicant has indicated they would be willing to do shared parking. He further stated as he understands it their parking requirements are pretty much what they have so he would have to defer to the Applicant regarding how much parking they felt they could share.

MR. SCHMITT inquired with the widening of Indian School Road will they take out the paved area or landscape area that is shown on the landscape plan or is this the final configuration? Mr. Grant stated it is a rough sketch. This is not exactly how this will match up but it does give the indication that the back of the ultimate improvements would provide for sidewalk access and have the ability to get screen walls, parking and any landscape in front of the screen wall.

Mr. Schmitt stated as a follow up to that question the widening of Indian School Road would not impact the elaborate paving pattern on the plaza on the corner. Mr. Grant replied in the affirmative. Mr. Schmitt stated his concern is some areas on Scottsdale Road where the road has been widened at one time had nice landscapes and generous sidewalks and are now gone and nothing is left but street asphalt and building and he wants to make sure that does not happen here. Mr. Grant stated the applicant has acknowledged that it is in their best interest that does not happen as well. There is interest on both sides of this to make sure it does not happen.

MR. GRANT stated they have had ongoing discussions with the applicant and they are recommending some minor changes to the stipulations. He reviewed the changes to the stipulations and are recommending the following:

Stipulation No. 3 is changed to read: The Two way be maintained but the drive through facility be relocated to the northwest side of the building.

Stipulation No. 4 is changed to read: with decorative pavers or other types of decorative pavement...reviewed to the satisfaction of Plan Review staff and a final plans submittal of that alternative would be required.

Stipulation No. 7 delete the word roadway so that it reads: A 15 foot wide public access...

The applicant return with a landscape plan to screen the parking of this project from the church site to the north.

Mr. Grant stated they still have to deal with the access through the Design Studio. The landscape screening to the north and the location of drive through facility. Those issues will return to the Board at a study session and staff would improve them.

Mr. Grant reviewed the slight modifications that have been made to the building.

SAM WEST reviewed the elevations for this project. He discussed the height and mass of the building. He reported he has met with the adjacent property owners and the neighborhood and has received complete support for the project. He discussed the changes to the pergolas and support columns.

COUNCILMAN LUKAS inquired if there would be asphalt in the parking area. One of the pictures made it look like a dirt surface. Mr. West replied it would be asphalt.

MR. SCHMITT inquired about the paving in between the street and the building. Mr. West stated it would be decorative paving.

MR. JONES stated he felt the pergola would be an interesting and eye catching element and makes the rest of the building neutral in background to it. He expressed his concerns regarding the columns for the pergola they seem very thin for stone columns. He stated he would appreciate if the applicant took one more look at the size and consistency and the relationship between those. Mr. West stated unfortunately the renderings the Board received were done prior to some additional study that was done on the pergolas noting the whole element has been lowered, and the columns have been made bigger. He reported the intent is to put a bronze statue in front of the pergolas. Mr. Jones suggested that they pull the stone away from the building and let it sit as a freestanding destination element. Mr. West stated they will look at that.

JOHN BERRY, 4800 N. Scottsdale Road stated his clients have been working with staff since March of last year on these issues. He further stated that the applicant only has until July 19th to close on this piece of property with the owners and a condition to close is that they have final site plan approval on this. Given the fact they have been willing to make substantial changes to make this a quality store, they are requesting they be given final site plan approval subject to the stipulations which Mr. Grant reviewed but not require them to come back to a study session. Allow staff to have the ability to have approval on the issue of the wall of the church, ensuring access through the Design Studio, and flipping the drive through to the side they could then close on this property.

MR. JONES stated moving the drive through to the west side is a significant improvement. He further stated previously this Board has agreed to the general idea of the site plan and the practical factors that have been brought up are reasonable. He remarked he would be willing to trust the staff to work out the remaining issues that they have.

MR. JONES MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 34-DR-2003 WITH THE STIPULATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN MODIFIED TODAY. THAT STAFF IS ENTRUSTED TO RESOLVE THE REMAINING DESIGN ISSUES. SECOND BY MR. SCHMITT.
THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

"For the Record" Court Reporters

